

September 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

and until it goes through the appropriation methods and the Congress appropriates it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CLERK. The amendment offered by Mr. SISK, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MULTER, is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charter Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the intent of Congress to make available to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia such measure and form of local self-government as they themselves shall democratically establish if such self-government is consistent with the constitutional injunction that Congress retain ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital. In taking this action it is further the intent of Congress to demonstrate its fundamental and enduring belief in the merits of the democratic process by exercising its retained legislative responsibility for the seat of the Federal Government only as it concerns amendments to any charter which might be established under this Act, but not as it concerns the routine municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

SELF-GOVERNMENT REFERENDUM AND CHARTER BOARD ELECTION

SEC. 3. (a) (1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a referendum, on a day specified by it, not later than one hundred days after the date of enactment of this Act to determine if the residents of the District of Columbia want self-government for the District of Columbia. The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The voters of the District of Columbia are being asked in this election whether they want a District of Columbia Charter Board created whose purpose would be to write a charter for the District of Columbia. The charter if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the creation of a District of Columbia Charter Board?"

-----yes-----no-----
(2) In order for the proposition to be approved, a majority of the registered voters must vote in the referendum and a majority of those voting must vote in favor of the proposition.

(b) The Board of Elections shall also conduct an election on the same day as the referendum to choose members of the Charter Board (to be established in accordance with section 4).

(c) Every qualified elector—

(1) who has registered with the Board of Elections, in accordance with section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, for the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section and who the Board of Elections ascertains is still a qualified elector, or

(2) who registers with the Board of Elections in accordance with subsection (d) of this section, shall be entitled to vote in such election and referendum.

(d) (1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a registration of electors under section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, during a period beginning as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty or less than twenty days before the date of the referendum and election.

(2) The Board of Elections may by regulation prescribe any reasonable method for ascertaining whether a person registered to

vote in the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section is a qualified elector. Any such person who it ascertains is a qualified elector shall be notified by mail before the beginning of the registration period established under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(e) (1) Before the beginning of the registration period the Board of Elections shall publish in each of the daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia a list of registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

(2) Not later than two weeks before the election and referendum, the Board shall publish and mail to each registered voter a voter information pamphlet which shall contain (A) a statement (not exceeding one hundred and twenty-five words in length) by each candidate for election setting forth his qualifications, (B) an argument for approval of the proposition to be submitted in referendum, and (C) if this Act is not passed in each House without opposition, an argument for disapproval of that proposition. Each argument shall not exceed five hundred words in length. The argument for approval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress who voted for the approval of this Act, one appointed from the House by the Speaker and one appointed from the Senate by the President pro tempore. The argument for disapproval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress, similarly appointed, who voted against the approval of this Act if there were Members in each House that voted against approval of this Act; otherwise such argument shall be written by one Member, who voted against approval of this Act, who shall be selected by the President pro tempore or the Speaker, as the case may be.

(f) (1) In the election of members of the Charter Board, there shall be a number of different ballot forms equal to the number of candidates. The Board of Elections shall arrange such ballot forms so that the order in which the candidates' names appear on the ballot forms is rotated from one voting precinct to the next. The rotation shall be accomplished by arranging one ballot form so that the names of the candidates are listed vertically in alphabetical order, and by arranging each succeeding form by placing at the bottom of the list the name which was at the top of the list on the preceding form. The forms shall be allotted to voting precincts by lot in a manner prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Elections.

(2) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliation, emblem, or slogan.

(g) (1) To be a candidate for the office of member of the Charter Board a person must be nominated in accordance with this subsection, must be a registered elector of the District of Columbia, and must have been a continuous resident of the District of Columbia for at least three years prior to the day of the election. The President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall be ineligible for membership on the Charter Board.

(2) To be nominated as a candidate a person must present a petition to the Board of Elections not less than forty-five days prior to the election. Such petition shall contain signatures of at least three hundred registered electors and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable filing fee of \$25. The Board of Elections shall determine the validity of the signatures contained in such petition.

(3) Members of the Charter Board shall be elected from the District of Columbia at large.

(h) (1) In the election each voter may cast one vote for each of not more than fifteen candidates. The fifteen candidates re-

ceiving the largest number of votes shall be elected.

(2) The Board of Elections shall certify the results of the election and referendum to the President, the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate, and the Board of Elections shall issue a certificate of election to each person elected to the Charter Board.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) If the proposition submitted to the referendum conducted under section 3 is approved, there shall be established an independent agency of the United States to be known as the District of Columbia Charter Board. The Charter Board shall be composed of the fifteen persons elected in the election conducted under section 3. The candidate for office of member of the Charter Board who received the highest number of votes in such election shall be chairman of the Charter Board until the Charter Board selects a chairman from among its number.

(b) Each member of the Charter Board shall be entitled to receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Charter Board, except that (1) a member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not be entitled to receive such per diem for any day for which he is compensated by the United States for his services as such an officer or employee, and (2) no member may receive more than \$5,000 in the aggregate for his services as a member.

(c) The Charter Board shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) The Charter Board may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Charter Board, but not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The District of Columbia government shall furnish such space and facilities in public buildings in the District as the Charter Board may reasonably request, and shall provide the Charter Board with such records, information, and other services as may be required by the Board for the carrying out of its function.

(f) The Charter Board may hold meetings, hearings, and issue subpoenas within the District of Columbia. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Charter Board or any member of the Charter Board designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

(g) Hearings of the Charter Board shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators.

(h) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$300,000 for the administrative expenses of the Charter Board.

(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Elections such sums as may be necessary to conduct the election and referendums authorized by this Act.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the limitations in subsection (b), the Charter Board shall have the power to propose a District of Columbia charter, within two hundred and ten days

from the day on which the election and referendum is held under section 3. Such charter shall, if approved in a referendum conducted under section 6 and if not disapproved by Congress under section 7, establish a municipal government for the District of Columbia. The Charter Board may propose a charter only by the vote of a majority of its members, and only one charter may be proposed. A copy of the proposed charter shall be transmitted to the Board of Elections.

(b) (1) The Charter Board is authorized to prepare a charter which may vest in a District of Columbia government complete legislative power over the District of Columbia with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation which are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. The Congress reserves the right, at any time after the adoption of such a charter, to exercise its constitutional authority to amend in whatever fashion it chooses any charter written pursuant to this Act. Provisions of a charter may provide for subsequent amendment of the charter by the people of the District of Columbia. Such an amendment must be submitted in a referendum. However, such an amendment shall not take effect if disapproved by Congress in the manner provided by section 7(c).

(2) The President of the United States may disapprove any legislation enacted by a District of Columbia government established under a charter approved pursuant to this Act, but his positive assent is not needed for any such legislation to take effect.

(3) The Charter Board may also provide in the charter for the creation of such courts as may be necessary to assume the functions, solely relating to the affairs of the District of Columbia, of any Federal court within the District.

CHARTER REFERENDUM

SEC. 6. (a) The Board of Elections shall submit to referendum the charter proposed by the Charter Board. Such referendum shall be conducted by the Board of Elections, on a day specified by it, not later than forty-five days after the Charter Board transmits the charter proposed by it to the Board of Elections. The provisions of section 3 relating to the referendum conducted under that section shall be applicable to the referendum conducted under this section, except that (1) the registration period shall begin as soon as practicable after the transmission of the proposed charter to the Board of Elections, (2) the arguments respecting approval of the proposition shall be written by members of the Charter Board appointed by the chairman thereof, and (3) the voter information pamphlet shall contain a copy of the proposed charter.

(b) The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

"The District of Columbia Charter Board has written a charter which, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the charter?"

-----yes-----no."

APPROVAL BY CONGRESS

SEC. 7. (a) A charter proposed by the Charter Board in accordance with section 5 and approved in referendum under section 6 shall be transmitted to the Congress. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

(b) (1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the District of Columbia Charter transmitted to Congress shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days following the date on which such charter is transmitted to Congress, unless between

the date of transmittal and the expiration of such ninety-day period there has been approved by either of the two Houses of Congress a resolution stating that that House does not favor such charter.

(2) If before the expiration of such ninety-day period the Congress shall approve a concurrent resolution stating that the Congress approves such charter, such charter shall take effect on the date of approval of such resolution.

(3) For purposes of this subsection in the computation of the ninety-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or sine die.

(c) Amendments to such Charter which are approved in a referendum shall take effect in the manner provided in subsection (b) for such Charter.

DISSOLUTION OF CHARTER BOARD

SEC. 8. The Charter Board shall cease to exist seven months after the approval of the proposition submitted to referendum under section 3, unless the Board proposes a charter under section 5, in which case the Board shall cease to exist on the day after the day on which a referendum is conducted under section 6.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Charter Board" means the District of Columbia Charter Board established by section 4 of this Act;

(2) the term "District of Columbia Election Law" means the Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1101 et seq.);

(3) the term "Board of Elections" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia; and

(4) the term "qualified elector" has the same meaning as it has in section 2(2) of the District of Columbia Election Law (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1102(2)).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to take the 5 minutes because I am sure each of us is interested in getting back to our office tonight. I would just simply say this: I would appreciate the serious consideration of every Member of this House on this substitute amendment which will appear in the RECORD in the morning. The bill is available in the back of the Chamber. The substitute that I have introduced is the original bill which I put in in July. I would appreciate my colleagues researching and reading that bill. It can be read within 10 minutes' time.

I would challenge anyone to show me where in any way it departs from the normal procedure that your own hometown would follow to secure its original charter or to secure a new charter. It is very simple. It is straightforward. It is to the point.

The question was raised a little while ago by one of my good friends and colleagues that we as Members of the Congress do not have time to spend on the affairs of the District of Columbia. This is why I believe even more strongly in my approach. Here among the Members of the Congress we have the talent to do it, but we do not have the time to spend and to analyze the problems and to write the type and kind of charter that is best for the city of Washington.

This proposal that I have offered will enable the citizens of the District of Columbia in a thoroughly democratic fashion to elect 15 of their own fellow citizens to sit down and spend 7 months to study this matter.

It further authorizes them to employ talent.

We provide up to \$300,000 for them to get the finest help to draw up the kind and type of government best suited to meet the peculiar problems of this city and then to submit it back to their electorate for their vote up or down. If the electorate of the city of Washington approves it, then it comes here for the Congress to take a look at it from a constitutional standpoint and we have 90 days to act. If we do nothing, it automatically becomes law. If we approve it, it becomes the law. Or, of course, either House can pass a dissenting resolution if in the opinion of the Congress it is not in line with the best interests either of the Federal Government or of the city of Washington.

This in essence sums up my proposal. As I say I challenge anyone in this House of Representatives to tell me wherein their city and their own people and residents of their own districts do any differently when your city or your hometown seeks either an original charter or a new charter.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman from California has suggested that all of us read the bill when it is printed in the RECORD. I know out of the gentleman's characteristic modesty, he would not suggest this, but I would suggest also that all of our colleagues read the splendid testimony that the gentleman gave during 2 days in his appearance before the subcommittee when we were conducting hearings. I think it would be very interesting and very helpful.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Thursday night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SOVIET AND COMMUNIST BLOC DEFAMATION CAMPAIGN

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include there-

September 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

with a paper entitled "The Soviet and Communist Bloc Defamation Campaign.")

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a major program to defame and discredit U.S. departments and agencies having responsibilities for national security has been conducted by the Soviet and Communist bloc since 1948. How it operates is explained in a paper, "The Soviet and Communist Bloc Defamation Campaign," which I submit for printing in the RECORD. Main targets are the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The paper follows:

THE SOVIET AND COMMUNIST BLOC
DEFAMATION CAMPAIGN
SYNOPSIS

1. The Soviet and Communist bloc effort to defame and discredit U.S. departments and agencies that have major responsibilities for national security has been underway since 1948. A major program is aimed at the Central Intelligence Agency and has grown markedly in quantity and intensity since the establishment of the KGB Department of Disinformation in 1959. This program now produces between 350 and 400 derogatory items annually. Communist press and radio attacks against the Agency reveal an increased sophistication in recent years. In addition, many Communist-inspired books and pamphlets which attack the existence, purposes, and status of CIA, and reflect a substantial budget for this activity, have appeared throughout southeast Asia, Africa, and the Near East.

2. CIA, in its intelligence role, is feared by the Soviets for its responsibility and ability to penetrate and unmask Communist conspiracies against democratic institutions. By striking at CIA, the attack also centers on the intelligence community with particular thrust against the FBI and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. The objective of the overall program is to achieve the destruction, breakup, and neutralization of CIA. A basic requirement of Soviet policy and a major objective of the Soviet intelligence services is the destruction of effective security collaboration among the non-Communist countries in order to carry out Soviet long-term strategic plans for subversion, political upheavals, popular fronts, and the eventual political isolation of the United States.

3. Defamation and forgery operations are conceived, directed, and perpetrated by a single organization located outside the target areas which makes use of local Communist or pro-Communist propagandists and of co-operating Communist bloc intelligence and security services. Although such undertakings are the products of the disinformation department of the KGB, known as department D, which is headed by Gen. Ivan Ivanovich Agayants, they are reviewed and passed on by the Soviet leadership. The operations of the Soviet Disinformation Department have been successful thus far in stimulating a wide replay in Africa, southeast Asia, the Middle East, and even in the United States. CIA will continue to be the prime target of Soviet disinformation and defamation operations.

SOVIET AND COMMUNIST DISINFORMATION

4. It is an established Soviet principle—now embraced by all members of the Communist bloc—that a large percentage of subversive activity be devoted to the planning and conduct of disinformation (dezinformatsiya) operations which mold, divide, and mislead other governments or leaders, and cause them to adopt policies and undertakings which are ultimately advantageous only to the Soviet Union. The Soviet leadership has charged the Soviet State Security Service, the KGB,

to place very great emphasis, both organizationally and operationally, on disinformation activity. Communist bloc services, in turn, are playing their part in this work.

5. What are disinformation operations? "Dezinformatsiya," in Soviet terminology, is false, incomplete, or misleading information that is passed, fed, or confirmed to a targeted individual, group, or country. "Propaganda," as it is defined by free world students, may be used as a support element of dezinformatsiya, but propaganda per se lacks the precision and bite of disinformation.

6. Soviet disinformation activity is planned and directed by a specialized department of the Soviet State Security Service. This KGB department, which was created to intensify Soviet disinformation activity, is headed by Gen. Ivan Ivanovich Agayants, a senior, professional intelligence officer with long experience and well-developed agent and political contacts in Western Europe, especially in France, where he served under the name Ivan Ivanovich Avalov. At one time in France he controlled the French spy Georges Pasques who was sentenced to life imprisonment on July 7, 1964.

7. The assignment of Agayants to take over the disinformation task indicates the high priority that the then Chairman of the Presidium, Nikita Khrushchev, gave to the campaign against American leadership and activity. Chairman Kosygin and First Secretary Brezhnev have made no changes in that program. Department D is still directly tied into the Presidium in the planning of its work.¹

8. Agayants' department is staffed by an estimated 40 to 50 geographical and functional specialists in Moscow alone; it avails itself directly and peremptorily of the worldwide resources, manpower and operations, of the Soviet security apparatus. The purposes, broadly stated, of the disinformation department are to:

(a) Destroy the confidence of the Congress and the American public in U.S. personnel and agencies engaged in anti-Communist and cold war activity.

(b) Undermine American prestige and democratic institutions and denigrate American leadership with NATO governments and other non-Communist countries, thereby contributing directly to the breakup of the NATO alliance.

(c) Sow distrust and create grounds for subversion and revolt against the United States in the Western Hemisphere and among the new nations of Africa and Asia.

These purposes and objectives, it must be emphasized, have been established by the highest elements of party and government in the Soviet Union.

9. Personal experiences with this program have been described by officers who have left the Soviet system and are now in the United States. One of these—Alexander Kaznacheev, who served in Burma as an information officer—described the program and the process in a recent personal memoir:

"Articles were originated in KGB headquarters in Moscow—for example, about alleged American support of the Indonesian rebels, frequent American violations of Cambodia's sovereignty, subversive activity of Japan in the region, etc. The articles were received from Moscow on microfilm and reproduced as enlarged photo-copies at the Embassy. It was my job to translate them into English. Some other members of

¹It will be recalled that Khrushchev, during his U.S. visit in September 1959, engaged in more than one discussion at the White House and during his tour designed to destroy confidence in American intelligence. His statements and remarks made during interviews, it is known, were prepared in advance in consultation with the department of disinformation.

Vozny's group would then arrange through local agents for the articles to be placed in one of the Burmese newspapers, usually pro-Communist-oriented. The newspaper would translate the article into Burmese, make slight changes in style, and sign it from 'Our special correspondent in Singapore,' for instance. Upon publication of such an article, the illegitimate creation of Soviet intelligence receives an appearance of legitimacy and becomes a sort of document.

"But the work was not yet finished. I then took the published article and checked it against the original Russian text. I noted all the changes and variations made by the newspaper, and wrote down in Russian the final version of the article. This final version was then immediately sent back to Moscow, this time through Tass channels.

"The last stage of this grandiose forgery was under the special care of the Soviet Information Bureau, Tass, Radio-Moscow, the Soviet press, and Soviet diplomatic representatives abroad. It is their duty to see that the material is republished and distributed in all countries of the region as if they were genuine documents which had appeared in the Burmese press."

10. Although the KGB is able to fabricate in Moscow whatever material is needed for its disinformation operations, it has been making more and more use of material published in the West, some of which had been planted there by earlier disinformation activities. An examination of the books and articles cited in any of the anti-CIA pamphlets reveals extensive use of Western source material, often taken out of context. The most recent Soviet articles on the Agency are exclusively "documented" from Western books, articles, and newspapers.

11. In the 58 pages of "CIA Over Asia," a slanderous booklet published in Kanpur, India, in 1962, for example, American newspapers and magazines are cited 11 times, periodicals of other Western or neutral countries 15 times. The fact that some references are made to Communist organs is obscured by repeated citations from reputable American publications.

12. A study of Soviet disinformation shows that the Soviets are engaged in an impressive research project to collect and process information and speculation about American intelligence and security services that appears in Western publications and newspapers. This study also has confirmed the deep interest of the Soviet services in the development and milking of Western journalists. Americans figure prominently among these.

13. The measure and depth of department D's activity against the CIA may be judged from a single episode. A booklet attacking the former Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Allen W. Dulles, entitled "A Study of a Master Spy" (Allen Dulles), was printed and distributed in London during 1961, and has since been reprinted. The ostensible author was a prominent maverick Labor Member of Parliament, one Bob Edwards, who was supposedly assisted in the effort by a British journalist. It is now known that the manuscript was researched in Moscow by a senior KGB disinformation officer, Col. Vasily Sitnikov, and then served up for final polish and printing in the United Kingdom. Mr. Dulles himself discussed this episode on a TV roundtable on March 29, 1964:

"Mr. HANSON BALDWIN. Well, that brings up, too, doesn't it, the question of disinformation? What kind of disinformation is being distributed by the Soviets today? Can you explain this, Allen?

"Ivan Mikhailovich Vozny, a KGB officer, was head of the political intelligence section at the Soviet Embassy in Rangoon, Burma.

"Alexander Kaznacheev, "Inside a Soviet Embassy" (New York, 1962), pp. 12-173.

"Mr. DULLES. Well, I have here right in my hand—

"Mr. BALDWIN. And what is disinformation, anyway?

"Mr. DULLES. Well, this is it. Here's 'A Study of a Master Spy.' Here's a booklet that was written about me. Now, it bears on the outside here, you see, 'A Study of a Master Spy.' I won't give you the names of the authors, but one of them is a member of the legislature of a very great, friendly country. But the real author of this—I am the 'master spy'—I have found out recently after certain research has been done, that the real author of this pamphlet is a Colonel Sitnikov, whom I believe you know, or know of. He is the real author.

"Mr. DERYABIN. Sitnikov? I used to work with Sitnikov in Vienna when he was deputy chief of the Soviet spy force, and he was the chief of an American desk, I mean, working against Americans. He was trained as an intelligence officer. One time he was a spy chief in Berlin and Potsdam, another time he was in Vienna. To my knowledge last time he was in Bonn as a counselor to the Embassy, but I mentioned him in my book and in the articles in Life in 1959, and it is my belief that he is at home now.

"Mr. DULLES. He has a whole dossier on me. I've read some things there about myself that even I didn't know."

CONTINUING ATTACK ON THE DCI

14. The resignation of Mr. Allen Dulles and the appointment of Mr. John McCone necessitated a shift in the Communist attack on the Director of Central Intelligence. The Soviet propaganda transition from one Director of Central Intelligence to another was accomplished by June 1963 with the publication of a pamphlet entitled, "Spy No. 1." Issued by the State Publishing House of Political Literature in Moscow (June 1963), the substance of the book is summarized on the title page:

"John Alex McCone is the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. Behind the exterior of a respectable gentleman is hidden the seasoned spy, the organizer of dirty political intrigues and criminal conspiracies.

"This pamphlet tells of the past of the chief of American intelligence, of the methods by which he amassed his millions and became the servant of the uncrowned kings of America, the Rockefellers, and of the influence which McCone exerts on the policies of the U.S. Government, particularly in the Cuban affair."

15. In November 1964, the Soviet newspaper Komsomol'skaya Pravda published a further attack on Mr. McCone entitled, "The Spy With the Slide Rule." Referring to Mr. McCone's activities as Director of CIA, the article added, "Under the leadership of McCone, the CIA was transformed from just an invisible government to a government of U.S. oil monopolies, mainly Standard Oil and its owners, the Rockefeller group. All of the military adventures in Lebanon, in southeast Asia, Aden, and Brazil, were carried out with the participation of emissaries of the man with the slide rule."

16. On December 8, 1964, Moscow domestic radio stated: "The American newspaper New York Herald Tribune had reported that:

"U.S. Central Intelligence Agency boss John McCone has secretly approached President Johnson with a resignation request * * * the American press prefers for the moment not to speak about the actual reason for McCone's resignation. The reason

"Peter Deryabin is a former KGB officer, now in the United States. His personal memoir, 'The Secret World' (New York, 1959) is probably the most authoritative public account of KGB organization and activity.

for it consists, in the first instance, in the serious collapse of American foreign policy, which, to a considerable degree, is formulated on the data provided by the CIA. Basing its activity on defense of the interests of the largest monopolistic groups based on the ideology of anticommunism and militarism, the CIA is proving incapable of a more or less objective correct appraisal of the balance of power in the world arena. * * * The American journalists, David White [sic] and Thomas Ross, drawing attention to the subversive activity of the CIA, just call it 'The Invisible Government.' * * * There is a basis to suspect, White and Ross write, that frequently the foreign policy of the United States as made public in the speeches of the State officials, acts in one direction, while secretly, through 'The Invisible Government,' it acts in the opposite direction."

17. President Johnson's appointment of Adm. William F. Raborn on April 11, 1965 gave the Soviet press another opportunity to review and renew its attack on the Director of Central Intelligence. Moscow domestic radio announced the next day that the appointment signified "the further strengthening of cooperation between the espionage apparatus and the military and military industrial monopolies."

18. An editorial published on April 14, 1965 in the Tanzanian newspaper, the Nationalist, which was replayed by the New China News Agency, claimed that Admiral Raborn's appointment implied an "attempt to save the face of the United States over accusations of interference in the internal affairs of newly independent states in particular."

19. Krasnaya Zvezda in Moscow asserted (April 13, 1965) that the departure of Mr. McCone and General Marshall S. Carter was "connected with new failures in assessing those forces against which American imperialism is aiming its aggressive blows." The article concluded, "The American imperialists probably assume that Raborn will be a more successful accomplice for them in the struggle against the peoples of the socialist countries and other freedom-loving peoples. These hopes are hardly justified, however, since in our era the course of historical events is not being determined by the Raborns and not even by their Wall Street bosses."

20. On June 5, 1965, the Greek Communist newspaper Avgli, in an article entitled, "U.S. Master Spy, William Raborn," alleged that the appointment of Admiral Raborn was intended "to lessen the enmity between the CIA and the Defense Department Intelligence Service." The article continued, "The main reason is the fact that the key posts in the American administration are now being taken over by representatives of the top and overt forms of monopolist capital, the most reactionary force that leans toward dangerous adventurism. At least that is what the events in Indochina, Dominican Republic, Congo, and elsewhere show."

THE COMMUNIST CHARGES AGAINST CIA

21. The themes exploited by the campaign of the Communist bloc against CIA, its Director, and its operations have remained generally the same since the beginning of the attack: Nevertheless, slants and replays have been constantly adjusted to changing world and regional political developments and to the vulnerabilities of target audiences and individuals, particularly in the newly emerging areas. The basic anti-CIA themes in use as of midsummer 1965 are:

(a) CIA is an instrument of American imperialism. It is racist, and a direct threat to national liberation movements.

* Reference is to the book by David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, "The Invisible Government," New York, Random House, 1964.

(b) In its work against national liberation movements, CIA engages in espionage, economic and political subversion, sabotage, assassination and terrorism; it trains and supports counter-revolutionary forces.

(c) CIA is an instrument of American aggression and gathers intelligence for aggressive plans against peace-loving socialist states. Diplomats, tourists, and scientists are used by CIA for these purposes.

(d) CIA dominates and generates American foreign policy.

(e) CIA engages in psychological warfare, utilizing falsehoods to undermine the international authority of the U.S.S.R.

(f) CIA is fighting the Communist Party of the U.S.A. and the Communist and Worker Parties of other capitalist countries.

(g) CIA spies on the allies of the United States and overthrows its henchmen who are unable to suppress national liberation movements.

22. The increasing weight of the attack on CIA becomes evident when an examination is made of the periodicals International Affairs, New Times, and Kommunist, all three of which are issued in Moscow, the first two in English and other languages. International Affairs carried one major article on American intelligence in 1960 and another in 1962. Since March 1964, there have been five articles devoted to that theme. These articles have alleged in general that intelligence controls U.S. foreign policy and big business controls intelligence." The New Times published one article on CIA in 1961, and one in 1963.

Three articles concerning CIA were published by this multilingual magazine during 1964. In May 1965, Kommunist published an article with the title, "The American Intelligence Service Is a Weapon of Adventurism and Provocation."

23. The assassination of President Kennedy was the subject of a book by Joachim Joesten entitled, "Oswald—Assassin or Fall Guy?" (1964) published by Marzani and Munsell Publishers, Inc. of New York, in which Joesten states that there is no question in his mind that Oswald was a minor CIA agent. Marzani, a known Communist, was coauthor of a pamphlet, "Cuba Vs. CIA," published in 1961. Joesten is revealed in a German Security Police memorandum, dated November 8, 1937, to have been an active member of the German Communist Party (KPD) since May 12, 1932; he was issued Communist Party membership card (Mitgliedsbuch) No. 532315.

24. A primary aim of Soviet disinformation is to sow distrust among the Western allies by discrediting the policies and motives of the United States and American methods of implementing those policies. Considerable attention is devoted to creating apprehension, uncertainty, and antagonism toward the United States among the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations. Thus, the Soviets reiterate the longstanding Communist charge that the United States is imperialistic and seeks world domination. They continually emphasize the theme that CIA is a major instrument in the execution of American policy. Two pamphlets, "CIA Over Asia" (Kanpur, 1962) and "America's Under-

* The articles were entitled "Imperialist Intelligence and Foreign Policy" (March 1964), "CIA Intrigues in Latin America" (June 1964), "An Imperialist Spy Consortium" (September 1964), "U.S. Intelligence and Foreign Policy" (October 1964), "U.S. Intelligence and the Monopolies" (January 1965). There were short references to CIA in articles dealing with other topics in its issues of July and August 1965.

* "American Cassandra" (Jan. 22, 1964) "Soviet Gold" and "The Espionage Jungle" (Aug. 12, 1964). There have been two pieces on CIA in the magazine to date in 1965.

September 28, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

24479

clared War" (Bombay, 1963), are dedicated to this theme.

25. An example of the use of the daily press and radio to mount this line of attack occurred 2 years ago in Ghana. Sufficient time has now passed to permit an evaluation of the episode. In late February and March 1963, CIA was subjected to an attack in the Ghana press and radio which attempted to tie the Agency to the death of Premier Qasim of Iraq. This campaign was allegedly based on an article in the French paper *L'Express* which asserted that CIA was the "author of the Iraq murder." An article in the *Ghana Evening News* for February 28, 1963 was headlined "Neo-Colonialist Terror in Iraq Menacing Threat Against Africa." On May 15, 1965, the *Spark*, a weekly Ghanaian newspaper, carried a front page story with the headline "The Secret War of CIA: The Killer at Your Door." According to the article, "This murderous game, which goes by the innocent-sounding name of 'Intelligence', has its Western-World nerve-center in America's Central Intelligence Agency, known briefly as CIA." Included in the article were eight illustrations of "spy equipment." Four of these illustrations had earlier appeared in West Berlin—The Facts, an anti-CIA tract that was published in Moscow in 1962.

26. A major theme developed principally in the uncommitted areas during the past 12 to 18 months has been the alleged interference of the United States, and especially CIA, in the internal affairs of other countries. Three recent pamphlets, "American Intelligence—This Is Your Enemy" (Cairo, April 1964), "The Truth About Komla Gbedemah" (Ghana, October 1964), and "Operation Boa Constrictor" (Colombo, 1964) develop the idea that through its intelligence and aid agencies, the United States is engaged in a conspiracy to dominate the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. The conspiracy allegedly takes the form of active efforts to overthrow anti-American governments and to gain economic control of these areas through foreign aid and economic exploitation.

SOVIET FORGERIES

27. One of the preferred instruments utilized by the Soviets to disseminate disinformation is the forged document. Detailed testimony on 32 U.S. forgeries attributable to the Communist bloc was given by Mr. Richard Helms of CIA on June 2, 1961, before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Fourteen new instances of forged U.S. official documents have come under scrutiny by the end of July 1965. Some of the more recent examples are still being studied. Although CIA has not been omitted from some of these spurious documents, the principal purpose of such forgeries has been to discredit U.S. policies and the representatives of other U.S. agencies overseas, such as the Department of State, USIA, the Peace Corps, the Armed Forces of the United States and American political leaders generally.

28. The Soviet defamation campaign, whatever may be its targets, has but one objective. Defamation of CIA is only an aspect of a coherent, well-orchestrated effort to denigrate the United States and its policies before world opinion. Every department and agency of the U.S. Government is a potential target of the disinformation department when such attacks will serve Soviet interests. Whatever may be the immediate subject of any single Soviet disinformation operation—CIA, the State Department, the Peace Corps, or USIA—the ultimate objective is to isolate and destroy what the KGB designates as "Glavni Vrag" ("Main Enemy"), the United States.

CONCERN GROWS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LOAN SHARK APATHY

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I addressed this body concerning the widespread abusive practices that are being used by loan sharks and some finance companies in dealing with servicemen.

I also pointed out that the Department of Defense has taken some action to curtail these abuses, which is commendable, but the action is far too little considering that these loan sharks and sharp-practice finance companies have been operating without restraint from the Department of Defense for years.

It is extremely gratifying to me to know that veterans' organizations throughout this country are also concerned about this problem. The Italian American War Veterans passed a resolution at its recent convention asking that the Department of Defense take all measures to stop such operators in general, and Federal Services Finance Corp. in particular.

Mr. Speaker, the Catholic War Veterans have also expressed their acute interest in this matter and have written to the Secretary of Defense inquiring as to the positive actions which have been taken to curtail the operations of loan sharks. I am including a copy of the letter to Secretary McNamara from the Catholic War Veterans national commander, Martin G. Riley. I only hope that in the near future the Defense Department will issue regulations that are strong enough to wipe out the vicious loan sharks that prey on our servicemen.

The letter follows:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS,

Washington, D.C., September 27, 1965.

HON. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: I have recently reviewed a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD For September 23, particularly with reference to the subject matter on page 24098 regarding an investigation of the Federal Services Finance Corp. I have also reviewed the hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st session, part I, covering hearings investigating the Federal Services Finance Corp. on June 9, 16, 17, 18; and July 14, 1965.

The information contained in these hearings is appalling and I am amazed that such a condition is tolerated or that you or your subordinates have not taken steps to prevent practices such as are indicated in these hearings, by this or any other company. To me one of the primary elements of command is protection of the troops, and I consider this to come within the scope of protection of the troops.

I would appreciate hearing of some positive action on the part of you or your subordinate commanders on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN G. RILEY,
National Commander.

LARRY O'BRIEN, POSTMASTER GENERAL

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to receive information that Larry O'Brien had been appointed to be Postmaster General of the United States. I have known Larry O'Brien for many years, both before and after my entering Congress. Larry O'Brien will bring to this office a broad background and knowledge of the United States and its individual cities, and I am very pleased that such an excellent choice has been made.

I regret that he will be leaving the White House legislative liaison position because we shall all miss his personal contact with each of us. We do hope, however, that we will be able to continue seeing and working with Larry in his new position.

NATIONAL 4-H CLUB WEEK

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, for myself, and I am sure for every Member of the Congress, I congratulate the 2,200,000 young men and women who belong to 4-H Clubs during this national 4-H Club Week. Sharing with them in this observance will be parents, leaders, and 4-H friends in all the 50 States of the American Union and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, 23 million different young people have participated in 4-H Club work since 1914 when the Smith-Lever Act authorized the Extension Service which helped finance and promote 4-H Club activity.

It is proper during National 4-H Club Week that we recall the great statesmanship and foresight of the late Congressman A. Francis Lever, of South Carolina, and the late Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, for sponsoring legislation which created our Extension Service.

Throughout our country this week great emphasis will be placed on National 4-H Club Week, and I hope a large number of young people will be influenced to join 4-H Clubs and that more men and women will become volunteer 4-H leaders. Ladies and gentleman of the House, I would like to emphasize the fact that these outstanding young men and women come from rural and urban communities.

Mr. Speaker, our 4-H Clubs have the answer to increasing crime, juvenile delinquency, immorality, and disrespect for law and order. These young men and women are a dynamic positive force in a world of turmoil, hatred, and war.

The 4-H emblem adopted in 1927 is the four-leaf clover with a letter "H" on each leaf. Each leaf stands for head, heart, hands, and health. The 4-H Club colors are green and white. The white background on the 4-H flag symbolizes purity; the green of the emblem represents nature's most common color, and

24480

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 28, 1965

is also symbolic of youth, life, and growth.

Mr. Speaker, the 4-H pledge is:

I pledge—
My Head to clearer thinking,
My Heart to greater loyalty,
My Hands to larger service,
My Health to better living, for my club, my community, and my country.

I salute and commend our 4-H Club young men and women during National 4-H Club Week and wish for them the very best always.

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS

(Mr. TUPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a group of Republican House Members initiated a study of United States-Canadian relations. We were very fortunate in having Dr. Douglas Bailey, a former research fellow at Harvard School of International Relations direct the staff work on this project; to him goes a major share of the credit for this endeavor.

We have published a report with a number of recommendations which we believe are worthy of consideration, toward the end of improving relations between the two great nations.

It is our hope that a large number of Members will take the time to peruse this report carefully.

The report follows:

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS

On June 28, 1965, the Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, former U.S. Ambassador to Canada, and the Honorable A. D. P. Heeney, former Canadian Ambassador to the United States and present Chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, issued their report on "Canada and the United States—Principles for Partnership." As an effort to calm tensions in an increasingly troubled relationship and as an effort to lay a broad foundation on which to build that relationship anew, the Merchant-Heeney report is a skillfully written document prepared by two masters of the diplomatic art. We hope that the two nations can now proceed to consider in depth the many real and practical issues which confront them.

This study has been designed to help the U.S. Government in its efforts to give substance to the principles defined in the Merchant-Heeney report. It is neither an exhaustive review of all United States-Canadian affairs nor a definitive examination of any single problem confronted by the two countries, but it does offer a broad number of specific suggestions for U.S. policy.

At the outset, we admit to a perspective on United States-Canadian relations which differs in degree from that embraced in the Merchant-Heeney report. We, too, in their words, "are convinced that the nature and extent of the relationship between our two countries is such as to require, in the interests of both, something more than the normal arrangement for the conduct of their affairs with one another." But we are convinced further that the nature and extent of that relationship requires, in the interest of future generations around the globe, something far more than a normal international arrangement. The United States and Canada, two sovereign nations, each appropriately jealous of its national independence,

have a unique opportunity to establish between themselves a model of relations between independent states which can serve to guide the future course of nations everywhere.

It is trite, but true, to talk of a world where every nation sits on the doorstep of every other, where communications with and travel to and knowledge of all parts of the globe are commonplace, and where the costs of misunderstanding and belligerence are immeasurable. It is in this perspective that the familiar clichés of United States-Canadian relations—the longest unfortified border, an unparalleled history of peace, and a common bond of purpose—take on new meaning. For it is in this perspective that Canada and the United States face their greatest challenge—in the search for the institutions and the goodwill which will allow great and independent nations to live at peace and in mutual prosperity.

We share the frustration of Dr. Phyllis Ross, chancellor of the University of British Columbia, who has written:

"The philosopher's dream of an age of plenty in which men through physical security might obtain serenity of mind seems, in an illusory and shifting way, to be almost within our reach. Yet many of these advances, far from placing man on the bright benchlands of a new civilization, have set him wandering aimlessly through strange and desperate valleys."

It must be the task of our two nations, individually and together, to seek the bright benchlands of a new civilization; for if the United States and Canada cannot establish a model of peaceful and progressive international relations; which nations can?

The greatest single deterrent to a new maturity in United States-Canadian affairs is an appalling ignorance about Canada in America. In a sense, our peoples and our nations have been too close, for we Americans tend not to think of Canadians as foreigners and not to think of Canada as an independent nation. Consequently, in the foreign policy of our Government and in the day-to-day lives of each of us, Canada and Canadians are too often taken for granted. Douglas LePan, principal of University College, University of Toronto, has echoed the understandable Canadian resentment:

The United States "must come to think of Canada not essentially as a playground, not as a source of raw materials, not as a useful, if backward, annex to the domestic market, not as a glacis between itself and the Soviet Union, not as the great out-of-doors where some millions of squatters have unaccountably settled, not as a museum of old-fashioned qualities miraculously frozen in ice, not as any of these things, but as a country with its own problems, possibilities, desires, faults, virtues, contradictions."

In 1967 Canada will celebrate 100 years of complete national independence. There could be no greater contribution to the Canadian centennial celebration than a new American awareness of Canadian nationhood. We propose that the U.S. Government, the administration and the Congress, and the American people recognize the year 1966 as "the year of a new awareness of Canada" which our governmental, educational, social, and cultural institutions make a new effort to broaden American understanding of Canadian history, geography, literature, culture, attitudes, and policy. This kind of concentrated effort is, in our view, a prerequisite to building on the North American continent a model of relations between independent and sovereign States.

Two words of caution: a new awareness of Canada as a nation must not lead to renewed interest in the old proposals for political integration on the North American continent. Quite the contrary, the purpose of a new American interest and the purpose of the combined efforts of the two nations

must be to seek to identify and reemphasize the constructive virtues of the Nation-State system while minimizing its destructive vices. Similarly we must be careful while seeking a new awareness of Canada not to fall prey to the illusion of continental isolation or to give others reason to believe that we have done so. Neither Canada nor the United States can withdraw from Europe or the world for the fate of our nations and our peoples are inextricably tied to those of all. In the 19th century the great British Prime Minister, George Canning, "called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old." But the hemispheres are no longer worlds apart—and we do not seek a new understanding between our two nations for our security or prosperity alone, but for the benefit of all nations of this 20th century "New World."

Before listing the specific proposals we believe to be appropriate in current United States-Canadian relations, some comment on Canadian foreign policy is in order. It is here where the American tendency to "take Canada for granted" has most seriously exacerbated tensions by resulting both in unfortunate examples of tactless U.S. diplomacy and in considerable shock and dismay at some Canadian policies.

Most of this could have been avoided, and can be avoided in the future, by a more acute awareness that an independent nation cannot be independent if its policies are subservient to another.

The Merchant-Heeney report quite correctly draws a distinction between the policy responsibilities of a super nuclear power and those of a "middle" power—a leader of the alliance and a loyal ally. In modern foreign affairs when the crisis has been immediate and great, Canada has never publicly opposed the United States. Most often she has been the first to stand at our side—but in those cases when she did disagree her disagreement was private.

The value of a staunch ally is measured in two ways: in times of immediate crisis and in the long haul. In times of immediate crisis the United States has no more staunch ally than the Canadian Government. In the long haul, Canada's value as an ally is to be found in her capacity to influence the course of history, in her capacity to persuade other nations to follow the course of peace and freedom. The capacity of a nation to influence people and events is limited indeed if it is but a satellite subservient to the wishes of a great power. The greatest strength of the North Atlantic Alliance, as a force to influence the course of history, is the knowledge that it is an alliance of independent governments, each freely elected by its people and each free to exercise its own judgment. By comparison the influence of the Warsaw Pact and its governments is pale indeed.

So while we do not always concur in the foreign policy of the Canadian Government, we cherish its capacity to exercise its own independent judgment and consider that independence a source of unending strength to the Western World.

The Merchant-Heeney report included the following language:

"In the conduct and development of their unique bilateral relationship . . . the two countries must have regard for the wider responsibilities and interests of each in the world and their obligations under various treaties and other arrangements to which each is party.

"This principle has a particular bearing upon our affairs in relation to the heavy responsibilities borne by the United States, generally as the leader of the free world and specifically under its network of mutual defense treaties around the globe. It is important and reasonable that Canadian authority should have careful regard for U.S. Government's position in this world context and, in the absence of special Canadian

Approved For Release 2003/09/26 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500070014-5

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE
TO: <i>Mr. Warner</i>		<i>10/14/65</i>
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS: <i>More of the same on the desin-formation paper</i> <i>JHB</i> <i>[Signature]</i>		
FROM:		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

Approved For Release 2003/09/26 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500070014-5
1 FFR 55 241 WHICH MAY BE USED.